



Appl. No. 09/896,238
Response to Office Action Summary

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.	:	09/896,238)	
Applicant	:	Grune, et. al.)	30 July 2009
Filed	:	06/21/2001)	
)	
TC/A.U.	:	2617)	
Examiner	:	Mizrahi, Diane D.)	
Docket No.	:	SIPS-VSM)	
)	For: SIMULTANEOUS INTELLECTUAL
)	PROPERTY SEARCH AND VALUATION
Commissioner for Patents)	SYSTEM AND METHODOLOGY (SIPS-V
Mail Stop: Amendment)	SM)
P.O. Box 1450)	
Alexandria VA 22313-1450)	

Remarks

In response to Examiner's objection to the drawings. Figures 1-5 are flow diagrams and were previously submitted in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that "All drawing should be corrected." A replacement sheet for Figure 6 is attached to this office action response in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d). Figure 6 contains alternative shading for ease of reading of the text. No new matter has been added.

The applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for withdrawing the objection to Figure 6 in that Figure 6 contains no matter that was not disclosed in the original specification.

In response to Examiner's claims objections in which claims 12-22 are objected to because of the following informalities: the use of the word "for" before a verb creates an intended use statement that has no function. These claims should be reworded using terms that require the element or potential functional limitation.

"Claims 12-10 recite the limitation "wherein"". Since "wherein" suggest or make optional the limitations following the claim language. Applicant recognizes that the claims objected to are found within claims 12-22, not 12-10, and responds accordingly.